UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,910	02/20/2004	Eric Peyrucain	17307.04104	5420

24257 7590 05/04/2005

STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP
1615 L STREET, NW
SUITE 850
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
HOLZEN, STEPHEN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3644	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/781,910	PEYRUCAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen A. Holzen	3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *11-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *11-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/20/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "a non-precision approach" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

3. Further the applicant has asserted the Harenberg does not disclose approach modes that the instant application is concerned with and then makes reference to specific pages and lines of the specification. The examiner would like to remind the applicant that he must point out the differences in the claims and the references used in the rejection.

4. In response to the applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-17: The applicant has not pointed out the asserted differences between the reference and the claims. Instead the applicant points to sections of the specification and asserts the

reference does not teach the limitations as limited therein. The examiner would like to remind the applicant that he must point out the differences in the claims and the references used in the rejection.

5. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

6. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 11-13, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harenberg Jr. et al (3,789,356).

Re – Claims 11 and 18: Harenberg discloses a method that operates the following steps simultaneously: verifying conditions relating to the correct function of a plurality of equipment of the aircraft and to the integrity and precision of measurements of parameters used for implementing the non-precision approach, based on information coming from the plurality of equipment (see Col. 3, lines 44-47), selecting an appropriate approach (see Col. 3, lines 1-6, and inherent), presenting the selected approach category on a display screen (display 15).

Re – the inherency assertion: It is inherent that an aircraft autopilot selects the most appropriate landing routine to safely land the aircraft. An autopilot will take into consideration the instant parameters of flights (speed, altitude, air conditions, rate of decent, weather conditions, and wind speed). The examiner would like to point out that Bateman et al (3,686,626) discloses in figure 3, that different approach categories are selected for various wind patterns (tail wind, no wind, head wind).

Re – Claims 12-13: Harenberg et al discloses a performance and failure assessment monitor #12. The failure assessment monitor is connected to "literally hundreds of inputs from sensors (each necessarily having their own circuitry and control) throughout the aircraft. The monitor operates on these inputs to generate signal representative of the position of the aircraft with respect to the runway. (see Col. 1, lines 58-65). Necessarily the autopilot of Harenberg would include: gyroscopes, air temperature sensors, wind speed sensors, fuel

gauges, airspeed, groundspeed, altitude sensors, and horizontal distance sensors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harenberg in view of Johnson (6,324,448). Harenberg discloses verifying correct functioning of all the inputs, computers and monitors on the aircraft and (as described above in regarding claim 11) discloses selecting a specific approach based on flight conditions and on the performance/accuracy of sensor inputs (see Col. 3, lines 1-6 and Col. 3, lines 44-47). Harenberg however does not disclose a satellite receiver. Johnson does, however, teach that it is known to use a GPS receiver in order to increase the accuracy of altitude measurements. (see abstract lines 7-11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include satellite receiver's installed/employed on the aircraft of Harenberg to increase redundancy and thus safety.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Holzen whose telephone number is 571-272-6903. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harvey E Behrend can be reached on 571-272-6871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sah

MICHAEL J. CARONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER